

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claim 1 has been amended to recite "receiving, by a virtual machine, a platform-specific event from a user input device, wherein the platform-specific event is associated with the first platform", "selecting, by said virtual machine, one of said first and second tasks as a selected task for receiving said platform-specific event so as to facilitate user interaction with said first and second tasks while said first and second tasks are concurrently supported by said virtual machine", and "manipulating said platform-specific event received from the user input device by modifying its data structure to be compliant with a data structure format supported by said selected task, thereby to represent said platform-specific event in a form that is accessible by said selected task". Similar amendments have been made in claims 12, 15, 18 and 20. Support for these amendments is found in the specification as filed, for example at paragraphs [0022]-[0024]. Claims 20 and 22 have been amended to recite a "computer readable storage medium". No new matter is being added by any of the present amendments.

The rejection of claims 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §101 are moot in light of the foregoing amendments. The rejection of claims 1-6, 8-20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is respectfully traversed. To satisfy the written description requirement, all that is required is "reasonable clarity". MPEP 2163.02. Also, an adequate disclosure may be made in any way through express, implicit or even inherent disclosure in the specification. This includes, words, structures, figures, etc. MPEP 2163(1), 2163.02. In the present case, modifying the data structure of an event is more than adequately disclosed in the specification as originally filed, for example at paragraphs [0034], [0041] and [0042], and figure 3. It is apparent from paragraph [0034] and figure 3 that the term "data" recited in paragraphs [0034], [0041] and [0042] refers to the data of an event. To wit, it is an event dispatcher that operates on the data (associated with an event) before placing it (the data) in an event repository. Thus, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, should be removed.

The present claims are patentable over the cited references. For example, Moore et al. (US 7171663) is silent regarding a user's interaction with a first and second task concurrently supported by a virtual machine, in particular by selecting one of the first and second tasks as a selected task for receiving a platform-specific event from the user. In addition, Moore fails to teach manipulating the platform-specific event received from a user input device by modifying its data structure to be compliant with a data structure format supported by said selected task,

thereby to represent said platform-specific event in a form that is accessible by said selected task. This reasoning is consistent with the reasoning on pages 5-6 of the Office Action.

Nitz et al. (US 6370590) discusses an approach for facilitating communication (i.e., transmitting messages) between sub-applications, wherein the sub-applications utilize different data formats. The format of a message is translated from the sending sub-application's format into a "common" format, before the message is translated from the "common" format into the receiving sub-application's format. In addition, a broker may be used to route messages from one sub-application to another. See Nitz at 7:23-54. If the teachings of Nitz were combined with those of Moore, the communication mechanism between sub-applications of Moore (if any) may be modified according to the teachings of Nitz to facilitate the interoperability of sub-applications. Nitz, however, would not address how a user, through platform-specific events, interacts with two tasks concurrently supported by a virtual machine, as recited in the present claims. Further, Nitz would not teach manipulating a platform-specific event received from a user input device to be compliant with a data structure format supported by the selected task. As mentioned above, Nitz only discusses communication between sub-applications, but not between a user input device and a task. Hence, the present claims are patentable over Moore, even in view of Nitz.

Gershman et al. (US 6199099) is cited for describing a foreground task, however, even if the selected task were a foreground task, the combined teachings of Moore, Nitz and Gershman would still suffer from the above-noted deficiencies.

Therefore, all of the presently pending claims are patentable over Moore, Nitz and Gershman, whether considered alone or in combination with one another.

If there are any additional fees due in connection with this communication, please charge Deposit Account No. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,
SONNENSCHEN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

Dated: March 24, 2009

/Tarek N. Fahmi/

Tarek N. Fahmi
Reg. No. 41,402

P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
(650) 798-0320